

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/614,156	Applicant(s) THACKER ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher Upton	Art Unit 1724	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher Upton.

(2) Mitchell Rose.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11 March 2005

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

32, 39 and 40

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record, Pielkenrood (4,067,813)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

It was agreed to amend claim 32 to incorporate the recitations of claims 39 and 40 to patentably distinguish over Pielkenrood, which discloses flow parallel to corrugations in a coalescer in a downflow configuration

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

CHRISTOPHER UPTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)